

Remarks

In this response, claims 27, 31, and 35 have been amended; claims 36 – 39 have been added; and claims 14, 18 – 20, 29 – 30, and 34 have been cancelled, without prejudice. Support for these amendments is found throughout the specification and, at least partially, detailed below.

Claims 3 – 6, 10 -11, 23, 26 – 28, 31 – 33, 35 - 39 are pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action claims 27, 29, 31, 3, 6, 10 – 11, 18 – 20, 23, 26, 28, 30, and 32 – 35 are rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Blinn et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,622) (hereinafter “Blinn”) in view of Wolff (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,047) (hereinafter “Wolff”), and further in view of Bezos et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,047) (hereinafter “Bezos”).

Claims 18 – 20, 29 – 30, and 34 have been cancelled rendering their rejections moot.

Claim 27, as amended, recites, in part, an information server to interpret a second portion of a pseudo resource identifier as a marketing code identifying a marketing source as an internet marketing source or a non-internet marketing source. Identifying the marketing source as either an internet marketing source or a non-internet marketing source may provide the basis for keeping statistics on the effectiveness of the various types of dissemination techniques. This may, in turn, allow an organization to determine the strategy for budgets of upcoming advertising campaigns.

Bezos, on the other hand, teaches a URL having a commission ID. The commission ID uniquely identifies an associate that refers a customer to the merchant's website. The associate may communicate the URL, and related product information, to a potential customer through a store of catalog documents. Bezos column 6, lines 67 et seq. The catalog documents may be disseminated through internet OR non-internet

means. Bezos column 8, lines 32 – 48. In either Internet or non-internet scenarios the URL will be the same. This is because the only information relevant to Bezos' teachings is the identification of the associate for a commission reward.

Furthermore, Bezos expressly teaches away from providing information indicative of the dissemination technique. The generic nature of dissemination is relied upon by Bezos so that the associate "...can use or switch between multiple catalog dissemination techniques (Web, e-mail, PUSH, etc.) without affecting the ability of the merchant Web site to identify and credit the associate." Bezos column 9, lines 2 – 5.

Thus, Bezos fails to teach or make obvious a marketing code that provides information about the dissemination techniques themselves, e.g., a marketing code that identifies a marketing source as an internet marketing source or a non-internet marketing source.

For at least these reasons this combination of asserted references fails to make claim 27, as a whole, obvious.

Claims 31, 3, 6, 10 – 11, 23, 26, 28 and 35 depend from, or include limitations similar to, claim 27. Therefore, these claims are patentable over these references for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Blinn, Bezos, Wolff, and Bijnagte (U.S. Patent No. 5,235,680) (hereinafter "Bijnagte").

Claim 14 has been cancelled rendering its rejection moot.

Claim 4 ultimately depends on claim 27. Bijnagte fails to correct for the above noted deficiencies with respect to claim 27. Accordingly, this claim is also patentable over this asserted combination.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Blinn, Bezos, Wolff, and Kirkevold et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,322) (hereinafter "Kirkevold").

Claim 5 ultimately depends on claim 27. Kirkevold fails to correct for the above noted deficiencies with respect to claim 27. Accordingly, this claim is also patentable over this asserted combination.

New Claims

Claims 36 – 39, which depend on claim 27, have been added. These claims add various additional points of patentability. For example, claim 27 adds that the marketing code further identifies a type of media used to disseminate the URL. This element is supported at least in page 24, line 17 – page 6, line 3. As discussed above, the URL of Bezos only identifies the associate and not the type of media that the associate may use to disseminate the URL.

For another example, claim 39 adds that at least a portion of information presented in the associated information page is based at least in part on the type of media. This element is supported at least in page 25, lines 11 – 16. There is no teaching in Bezos that discusses customizing the information page based on the identity of the type of media.

Conclusion

For these reasons the Applicants believe the present claims are patentable over the cited references and, therefore, respectfully request that a Notice of Allowance be issued. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2972. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Dated: 10/15/2007

/Nathan R. Maki/
Nathan R. Maki
Reg. No. 51110

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981